Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
APR 14 1979
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1978

78- 1298

WILLIAM BAIRD, Et al.,

Petitioners

vs.

ALEXANDER E. SHARP II

Respondent

Petition For A Writ of Certiorari To The
United States Court of Appeals For
The First Circuit

MOTION TO APPOINT COUNSEL FOR CHILDREN UNBORN AND BORN ALIVE

ALAN ERNEST
5713 Harwich Ct. #232
Alexandria, Va 22311

Counsel for Movant

MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF ALAN ERNEST AS COUNSEL FOR CHILDREN UNBORN AND BORN ALIVE

The Court is moved to appoint Alan Ernest as counsel, or guardian ad litem, to represent the children unborn and born alive in this case.

Alan Ernest is a lawyer in the District of Columbia, and a member of the bar of this Court. His interest is to defend the constitutional rights of children unborn and born alive.

Counsel will present new evidence, unquestionably unparalleled in the legal history of this nation, not presented by the parties. This new evidence is outlined in the attached brief in support of this motion.

The new evidence shows that many of the killings that Roe v Wade asserted to legalize were murder in 1868 and punishable by the death sentence. Obviously, a child whose life was protected by the murder laws in 1868 is a person within the language and meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment. Absent a constitutional amendment, the killings are still murder. Justices who presumed to permit these killings may be subject to the death penalty in very many states.

The counsel also adopts by reference the evidence submitted in the amicus brief by the LEGAL DEFENSE FUND FOR UNBORN CHILDREN. That evidence shows Roe v Wade to be based on false evidence and millions of lives to be unconstitutionally exterminated.

WHEREFORE, the Court is moved to appoint Alan Ernest to be counsel to defend the children unborn and born alive.

Alan Ernest
Counsel

BRIEF

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

MANY ROE v WADE KILLINGS ARE MURDER

The evidence will show that many of the killings permitted by Roe v Wade, 410 US 113(1973) were murder in 1868. Since the killings were murder in 1868, then absent a constitutional amendment, the killings are still murder, and Roe v Wade is no law at all.

ARGUMENT

1. Introduction to Evidence

The evidence presented herein will show that, at the time the Fourteenth Amendment was adopted in 1868, the unlawful killing, with malice aforethought, of a child born alive was murder. Killings of children born alive were not treated as a special category, as was abortion.

It is thus absolutely indispensable to examine what "born alive" meant in 1868. It is obvious that, if the life of a child born alive was protected by the murder laws in 1868, then it is a person within the language and meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment.

The evidence shows that in 1868, born alive did not mean natural birth after nine full months gestation; nor did it mean birth after viability ("that is, potentially able to live outside the mother's womb, albeit with artificial aid." Roe v Wade, 35 L Ed 2d at 181). If abortion resulted in a live but unviable child that died as a consequence of its not being able to survive outside the womb, it was murder and punishable by the death penality.

The evidence shows that the hysterotomy is a common method of performing abortions under Roe v Wade. This is essentially a Caesarean, in which a live but unviable child is removed from the womb and left to die. The legal authorities show that in 1868, such a killing was murder and punishable by the death sentence.

In summary, what was murder in 1868, can not now be decreed a constitutional right. Without an amendment to the Constitution, the killings must still be murder, and the Justices who permitted these killings may be guilty of mass murder in the first degree. This is still punishable by the death sentence in many states.

2. The English Law

The English law, as reflected in the writings of Coke(3 Inst. 50), Hawkins(1 Hawkins Bk. 1, ch. 16) and Blackstone (4 Bl. Com. 198) defined the felonious killing of a child "born alive" as murder, even if the child received the fatal wound in the womb.

These authorities were followed by the English courts in permitting prosecutions of the killing of children born alive as murder. Rex v Senior, 1 Moody CC 346(1832); Reg. v Trilloe, 174 Eng. Rep. 674(1842); Reg. v West, 2 C & K 784(1848).

Most critically, in the English law, a child did not have to be viable to be born alive. In 1848 the leading case of Regina v West, 2 C & K 784, was decided. The indictment for murder alleged that the defendant had inserted a "certain pin" "upward into the womb" of a pregnant woman for the purpose of producing the abortion of a "quick" child; and that this resulted in the child being "prematurely born and brought forth alive from and out of the womb." Id., 784-85. The child died shortly thereafter. A

"medical witness" had testified that:

"(I)t was a healthy child; but that, being born at that period of gestation, it was impossible that it could live any considerable length of time separated from the womb of the mother. It was incapable of maintaining a separate and independent existence." Id., at 786.

The judge, relying on Coke and Blackstone, instructed the jury:

"The prisoner is charged with murder; and the means stated are, that the prisoner caused the premature delivery of the witness Hensen, by using some instrument for the purpose of procuring abortion; and that the child so prematurely born was, in consequence of its premature birth, so weak that it died. .... I am of the opinion (and I direct you in point of law), that if a person intending to procure abortion does an act which causes a child to be born so much earlier than the natural time, that it is born in a state much less capable of living, and afterwards dies in consequence of its exposure to the external world, the person who by her misconduct so brings the child into the world, and puts it thereby in a situation in which it cannot live, is guilty of murder." Id., at 788.

The case of Regina v West, supra, was presented by the leading English writers as the correct statement of the law of murder. See, e.g., 2 J.F. Archbold, A Complete Treatise on Criminal Procedure, Pleading and Evidence 783(Waterman Am. ed. 7th ed. 1860); 1 W.O. Russell, A Treatise on Crimes and Misdemeanors 671-72 (4th ed. 1865); A.S. Taylor, A Manual of Medical Jurisprudence 516(Penrose Am. ed. 6th ed 1866). Consequently, the evidence shows that in the English common law, the abortion of a quick but unviable child that resulted in the child being born alive so prematurely that its death was caused by its inability to survive outside the womb, was murder.

3. The American Law Of Murder In 1868

The English common law of murder of children born alive is significant since American courts used the English common law to construe their murder statutes. Clarke v State, 117 Ala 1(1898); Hamilton v United States, 26 App. D.C. 382(1905).

American courts cited Coke, Hawkins, Blackstone, and the English court decisions, as authoritative precedents on the law of homicide of children born alive. See, e.g., Clarke v State, 117 Ala. 1(1898); State v Winthrop, 43 Iowa 519 (1876). By 1868, leading American legal authorities had specifically cited Regina v West, supra, as the correct law of murder of a child born alive. (As already noted, that case held that if a criminal abortion resulted in the premature delivery of a quick but unviable child that died after delivery as a consequence of its being so prematurely delivered that it could not survive outside the womb, it was murder.) See, e.g., F. Wharton, A Treatise on the Law Homicide in the United States 96-97(1855). By 1868, this appears to be the uncontradicted view.

Consequently, the evidence shows that the life of a quick but unviable child born alive was protected by the murder laws in 1868.

4. The Law Of Murder In 1868 And The Fourteenth Amendment

Since the evidence shows that the life of a quick but unviable child was protected by the murder laws in 1868, the evidence likewise establishes that the child so born alive is a person within the language and meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment.

By seizing upon viability, Roe v Wade permits the killings of quick but unviable children born alive. The Supreme Court presumed to decree the killing of these children to be a constitutional

right without any examination whatsoever to see if these children were persons within the language and meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment. It is a naked decree without any investigation into the law of murder of children born alive.

This raises the question,- Does the Supreme Court have the Hitler-like power to decree murder to be a constitutional right? If invalids were protected by the murder laws in 1868, can the Supreme Court, without evidence or investigation, decree a constitutional right to kill invalids? If Jews were protected by the murder laws in 1868, can the Supreme Court decree, without evidence or investigation, a constitutional right to kill Jews? If newspaper editors were protected by the murder laws in 1868, can the Supreme Court, without evidence or investigation, decree a constitutional right to kill newspaper editors?

No doubt the Supreme Court bears the burden of proving, by evidence so conclusive that it will not admit of a rational doubt, that it possesses the power to decree murder to be a constitutional right.

5. The Hysterotomy Abortion Under Roe v Wade

A common way to perform abortions under Roe v Wade is by hysterotomy. See, e.g., Commonwealth v. Edelin, 359 NE 2d 4 (Mass. 1976). A hysterotomy is essentially a Caesarean, in which a live but unviable child is removed from the womb and left to die. See, 1 Hearings Before The Subcommittee On Civil And Constitutional Rights Of The Committee Of The Judiciary, House of Representatives On Proposed Constitutional Amendments on Abortion 397(GPO 1976).

As established by medical testimony during the 1976 House Abortion Hearings, "With few exceptions, babies aborted by this method will all move, will all breathe, and some will cry. . . .Almost all are born alive." Id., at 397.

Consequently, by definition, in 1868, these hysterotomy abortions could have been prosecuted as murder.

6. ROE v WADE AND MISTAKE OF LAW

The Supreme Court itself has recognized that constitutional provisions against ex post facto laws do not apply to judicial decisions. Ross v Oregon, 227 US 150(1913). Consequently, if Roe v Wade is a mistake of law, then mass murder is being perpetrated in America. The Roe v Wade hysterotomy killings, by definition under the common law and thus constitutional law, violate the positive criminal murder statutes throughout the United States.

The killings of children born alive have been prosecuted as murder in the first degree, Comm. v Harmon, 4 Barr. 269(Pa 1846)(child thrown in creek); or murder in the second degree, Clarke v State, 117 Ala. 1 (1898)(wife beaten, child die from injuries) or manslaughter, People v Chavez, 77 Cal. App. 2d 621(1947)(child neglected),- according to the facts of the particular case, as in any other homicide.

In connection with these judicial killings, it is relevant to note that the Supreme Court decreed murder to be a constitutional right without any examination whatsoever of the law of murder of children born alive. And as Abraham Lincoln noted, "(I)t is an established maxim in morals that he who makes an assertion without knowing whether it is true or false, is guilty of falsehood; and the accidental truth of the assertion, does not justify or excuse him." 1 The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln 384 (Basler ed. 1953). Since Lincoln's day, this "maxim in morals" has also been a textbook definition of perjury. See, e.g., 3 Wharton's Criminal Law and Procedure, Sec. 1308, p. 673(12th ed 1957).

Consequently, rational people are entitled to believe, and a jury may be permitted to find, that the process by which the Supreme Court decreed

murder to be a constitutional right is perjury or criminal fraud. It seems reasonable that such judicial killings, after such prolonged deliberation and adherence, could be prosecuted as murder in the first degree. Many states still punish mass murder in the first degree with the death sentence.

It may be that the judges responsible for the judicial killings did not believe that they were breaking the law. But as Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes once wrote, "Ignorance of the law is no excuse for breaking it." "It is no doubt true that there are many cases in which the criminal could not have known that he was breaking the law, but.. ...the lawmaker has determined to make men know and obey." Holmes, The Common Law 41(Howe ed 1963).

It now full well appears that the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States have presumed to decree murder to be a constitutional right, without any evidence or examination whatsoever, with the death penalty the possible consequence of their decision being a mistake of law.

It now appears that, unless the Supreme Court can prove by evidence, beyond a doubt based on reason, that it has the Hitler-like power to decree mass murder to be a constitutional right, then Roe v Wade is just such a mistake of law.

CONCLUSION

Is government of laws founded upon evidence, or the mere naked decrees of men holding office for life?

The evidence proffered herein would appear sufficient to permit reasonable people to conclude beyond a reasonable doubt that the Supreme Court of the United States has committed mass murder in the first degree. The evidence would appear sufficient for reasonable people to conclude that, upon a scale never seen before in the peacetime history

of the world, "The dagger of the assassin was concealed beneath the robe of the jurist." The Justice Case, 3 Trials of War Criminals Before The Nuernberg Military Tribunals 985(GPO 1951).

If the United States were being ruled over by a Tribunal of Murderers, holding office for life, nakedly decreeing mass murder to be a constitutional right, in open defiance of the evidence, and presuming to be blindly obeyed by all courts, executives, legislatures, and people whatever without question, regardless of the evidence, then surely it would be the most astounding event in the legal history of the human race.

Alan Ernest
Counsel